



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/734,348	12/12/2003	Mustansir M. Banatwala	LOT9-2003-0071-US1 (7321-	3612
46321	7590	05/22/2006	EXAMINER TIV, BACKHEAN	
CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP STEVEN M. GREENBERG 1300 CORPORATE CENTER WAY SUITE 105G WELLINGTON, FL 33414			ART UNIT 2151	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 05/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/734,348	BANATWALA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Backhean Tiv	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/9/06.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

Detailed Action

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application. This is a response to the RCE filed on 2/9/06. Claims 1-19 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,058,416 issued to Mukherjee et al.(Mukherjee).

As per claim 1, 8, 15, Mukherjee teaches collaborative computing method for the establishment of a named collaborative space, the method comprising: providing a named collaborative space defining a work place within the collaborative computing environment and configured to manage a plurality of business process components disposed within the named space in a one-to-many relationship(col.2, lines 60-col.4, line 6); identifying a membership set for the named collaborative space, the membership set including one or more members(Fig.5); and providing a plurality of business process component instances for management within the named collaborative space(Fig.5, col.6, lines 21-62);

and, managing a common lifecycle for each of the named collaborative space and the business process components within the named collaborative space(col.7, lines 15-67);
and storing a membership set for the collaborative space, the membership set identifying one or more members(Fig.5, col.6, lines 21-62);
a database, the database storing: a membership set for the collaborative space, the membership set identifying one or more members(Fig.2-5, col.2, lines 60-col.4, line 6); and data corresponding to a named space defining a work place within the collaborative computing environment and a central processing unit functioning to provide at least one business process accessible within the named space, the central processing unit in operative communication with the database(col.2, lines 60-col.4, line 6).

As per claim 2, 9, 16 wherein the business process component instances are business component instance visualized via a portlet(Figs. 2-5, col.6, lines 22-67).

As per claim 3,10,17 wherein the members of membership set for the collaborative space are assigned a role, the role defining access and permission privileges to the at least one business process(col.7, lines 15-67).

As per claim 4,11,18 wherein the established named collaborative space is templatable to serve as the basis for the establishment of other named collaborative spaces(col.7, lines 15-67).

As per claim 6, 13, the transfer of information using enterprise java bean(col.5, lines 17-26).

As per claim 5,12,19 wherein the established named collaborative space is provisionable from other named collaborative spaces(col.7, lines 15-67).

As per claim 7,14 further including assigning a policy to the named space(col.7, lines 15-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5,7-12,14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,008,853 issued to Bly et al.(Bly) in view of US 6,901,448 issued to Zhu et al.(Zhu).

As per claim 1, 8, 15, Bly teaches collaborative computing method for the establishment of a named collaborative space, the method comprising: providing a named collaborative space defining a work place within the collaborative computing environment and configured to manage a plurality of business process components disposed within the named space in a one-to-many relationship(Figs.3,9, col.20, line 1-15); and providing a plurality of business process component instances for management within the named collaborative space(Figs.3,9,col.9, lines 10-26);

and, managing a common lifecycle for each of the named collaborative space and the business process components within the named collaborative space(col.9, lines 10-26); and data corresponding to a named space defining a work place within the collaborative computing environment and a central processing unit functioning to provide at least one business process accessible within the named space, the central processing unit in operative communication with the database(Figs.3,9, col.20, lines 1-15).

However Bly does not explicitly teaches identifying a membership set for the named collaborative space, the membership set including one or more members; and storing a membership set for the collaborative space, the membership set identifying one or more members; a database, the database storing: a membership set for the collaborative space, the membership set identifying one or more members. Bly does suggest the use of members(Fig.6), describes an user interface with an access list and access rights, element 68.

Zhu explicitly teaches identifying a membership set for the named collaborative space, the membership set including one or more members(Fig.3,18-20,col.4, lines 12-57); and storing a membership set for the collaborative space, the membership set identifying one or more members(Fig.3,18-20, col.4, lines 12-57); a database, the database storing: a membership set for the collaborative space, the membership set identifying one or more members(Fig.3,18-20, col.4, lines 12-57).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Bly to explicitly identify members as taught by Zhu in order to allow computer users at different location to communicate and share documents or applications(Zhu, col.1, lines 25-62).

One ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Bly and Zhu in order to provide a system to allow computer users at different location to communicate and share documents or applications(Zhu, col.1, lines 25-62).

As per claim 2, 9, 16 wherein the business process component instances are business component instance visualized via a portlet(Bly, Figs. 1-15).

As per claim 3,10,17 wherein the members of membership set for the collaborative space are assigned a role, the role defining access and permission privileges to the at least one business process(Bly, Fig.6, Zhu, Figs. 3, 18-20).

Motivation to combine set forth in claim 1.

As per claim 4,11,18 wherein the established named collaborative space is templatable to serve as the basis for the establishment of other named collaborative spaces(Bly, col.9, lines 10-30).

As per claim 5,12,19 wherein the established named collaborative space is provisionable from other named collaborative spaces(Bly, Abstract, Zhu, col.4, lines 9-56). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 1.

As per claim 7,14 further including assigning a policy to the named space(Bly, Figs. 1-6).

Claims 6,13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,008,853 issued to Bly et al.(Bly) in view of US 6,901,448 issued to Zhu et al.(Zhu) in view of Office Notice.

Bly in view of Zhu does not explicitly teach as per claim 6, 13, the transfer of information using enterprise java bean.

Office Notice is taken; it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use enterprise java bean to transfer information because java bean is a reusable application component that can be combined with other java bean components to create a java applet or application. It would have been obvious to add the use of java bean to transfer information to Bly in view of Zhu in order transfer messages from one person to another with different computing platform.

One ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine the use of java bean with Bly in view of Zhu in order to provide a system where once a program is written once, it can run on any computing platform to transfer information from one user to another.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Backhean Tiv whose telephone number is (571)272-3941. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 A.M.-12 P.M. and 1 -6 P.M. Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Backhean Tiv
2151
5/18/06


Khanh Dinh
Primary Examiner